REMARKS

Claims 33-53 were pending in the application prior to this amendment. Claims 33-53 were rejected and have been cancelled. New claims 54-75 have been added. Applicant requests consideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Telephone interview

A telephone interview was conducted on September 13, 2007 between Examiner Chau Nguyen and Attorney Michael Cofield to discuss a proposed amendment. During the telephone interview, the Examiner agreed that the proposed amendment overcomes the rejections based on Nakai. The Examiner also suggested claim amendments, which have been incorporated into the amended claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 33-35, 38-39, 41-45, 48-49 and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakai et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,253,248 and further in view of Booth, U.S. Patent No. 6,345,307.

Claims 33-35, 38-39, 41-45, 48-49 and 51-53 have been cancelled.

New claim 54 has been added. *See* pages 13-14 of the present specification. None of the cited references teach at least the features of "when the user is authorized, identify at the local server a privilege level associated with the user, the identified privilege level defining how the user is permitted to control an operating system running on the remote server" and "filtering the commands received at the local server according to a verification of whether the received commands correspond to the identified privilege level."

Nakai discloses a proxy that performs protocol conversion on communications exchanged between a client and a server. The proxy does not identify a privilege level defining how the user is permitted to control an operating system running on the remote server. Nor does the proxy filter commands based on an identified privilege level.

At least portions of Booth are not prior art because Booth was filed after the present application. Only those portions supported by the Booth provisional application can possibly be prior art. *See* MPEP 2136.03, paragraph III. Even if the entire disclosure of Booth were prior art, Booth discloses compressing IP messages, which is different than the claimed features.

Morag discloses transmitting large files between a client 10 and a server 16. There is no local server located between the client 10 and the server 16, let alone a local server performing the claimed features.

In contrast, claim 54 includes the features of "when the user is authorized, identify at the local server a privilege level associated with the user, the identified privilege level defining how the user is permitted to control an operating system running on the remote server" and "filtering the commands received at the local server according to a verification of whether the received commands correspond to the identified privilege level." Thus, claim 54 should be allowed. New claims 55-75 include similar features and thus should be allowed for at least similar reasons.

In addition to the reasons stated above, claim 63 should be allowed because none of the cited references teach at least the features of "wherein the single OS level account is a generic account that does not restrict administrative privileges, and the central servers impose differing restrictions on the remote users through command filtering." This feature reduces or eliminates the need for multiple OS level user accounts on the content server. *See* the present specification, page 13. Moreover, this feature increases security because passwords for OS level user account(s) need not be provided to users. *See* the present specification, page 13.

In addition to the reasons stated above, claims 66 and 67 should be allowed because none of the cited references teach at least the features of "wherein the content server performs transactions according to the forwarded commands..." and the central server to create "...one or more session log entries that identify the forwarded commands, the session log entries containing information allowing a system administrator to undo the transactions."

Claims 36-37, 40, 46-47 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakai and Booth as discussed in claims 33-35, 38-39, 41-45, 48-49 and 51-53 above and further in view of Morag et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,058,399.

Claims 36-37, 40, 46-47 and 50 have been cancelled.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 224-2170 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP

Michael A. Cofield
Reg. No. 54,630

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600
Portland, Oregon 97205

Customer No. 73552